R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 020 572 24 EA 001 369

A STUDY IN ORGANIZATIONAL INTERACTION BETWEEN AN EVENING COLLEGE AND ITS PARENT INSTITUTION. FINAL REPORT.

BY- JACOBSON, MYRTLE S.
NEW SCHOOL FOR SOCIAL RESEARCH, NEW YORK, N.Y.

REPORT NUMBER BR-6-8725 PUB DATE 15 JAN 68
CONTRACT OEC-1-7-008725-2005
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$1.84 44P.

DESCRIPTORS- *ORGANIZATION, *EVENING COLLEGES, *COLLEGES, EDUCATIONAL INNOVATION, EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES, RESOURCE UTILIZATION, *RELATIONSHIP, *POWER STRUCTURE, COLLEGE ADMINISTRATION, BROOKLYN COLLEGE,

THIS STUDY IN ORGANIZATIONAL INTERACTION ANALYZES THE STRUCTURAL TIES AND INTERACTIVE RELATIONSHIPS OF AN EDUCATIONAL SUB-ORGANIZATION (EVENING DEGREE PROGRAM) AND ITS PARENT COLLEGIATE INSTITUTION (BROOKLYN COLLEGE). AN EXAMINATION OF OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS, CORRESPONDENCE, POLICY STATEMENTS, AND MANY INTERVIEWS, QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEYS, AND STATISTICAL ANALYSES REVEALED THE FOLLOWING GENERALIZATIONS--(1) ONCE THE SUB-ORGANIZATION IS GIVEN LIFE, IT STRIVES FOR GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT IN ITS OWN TERMS WITHIN ITS OWN VALUE SYSTEM, BUT THE FORMAL ARRANGEMENTS ARE SUCH THAT IT CONSTANTLY HAS TO FACE THE CONTROLLING RESTRAINTS OF THE PARENT THAT GAVE IT VITALITY, (2) WHAT THE SUB-ORGANIZATION IS, WHAT IT HOPES TO BECOME, AND WHAT IT DOES BECOME ARE STRONGLY CONDITIONED BY THE ORGANIZATIONAL MILIEU IN WHICH IT EXISTS AND OPERATES, AND (3) THE SUB-ORGANIZATION, BY VIRTUE OF ITS QUEST FOR SEPARATE IDENTITY, SEEKS THE FREEDOM TO FORMULATE ITS OWN GOALS AND TO IMPLEMENT MEASURES UNDER CONDITIONS OF COORDINATED CONTROL. POLAR FORCES OF FREEDOM AND RESTRAINT ARE THUS IN A STATE OF TENSION, AND IT IS OUT OF THIS THAT THE INTERACTIVE PROCESS MUST OPERATE. (HW)

ED020572

BR-6-8725
P.A. 24

FINAL REPORT
Project No. BR 6-8725-24
Grant No. OEC 1-7-008725-2005

A STUDY IN ORGANIZATIONAL INTERACTION BETWEEN AN EVENING COLLEGE AND ITS PARENT INSTITUTION

January 15, 1968

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
Office of Education
Bureau of Research

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

EA 001 369

A STUDY IN ORGANIZATIONAL INTERACTION BETWEEN AN EVENING COLLEGE AND ITS PARENT INSTITUTION

Project No. BR 6-8725
Contract or Grant No. OEC 1-7-008725-2005

Professor Myrtle S. Jacobson

January 15, 1968.

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

NEW SCHOOL FOR SOCIAL RESEARCH
New York, New York

Contents

Subject	Page
Acknowledgements	1
The Scope of the Study	3
The Problem of Goals	4
The Historical Setting	5
The Scarcity of Shared Resources	6
The Nature of the Goals	6
The Problems of Innovation and Cooptation	8
The Problems of Authority and Responsibility	11
The Problems of Stress and Strain	16
Pressure from the City University	16
Transmitted Pressure from the College	17
Pressure from the Board	18
Consequences of Stress and Strain	19
The Problems of Image and Identity	20
A Typology of Evening Colleges	23
The Fully Integrated Type	24
Autonomous as a Separate College	25
Parent - Sub-Unit Relationship	26
A Blueprint for Better Balance	29
Administrative Authority of SGS Dean	30
SGS Instructional Staff	33
To Mold the Future	36
Appendices	37

Acknowledgements

This final report represents a concise statement of a doctoral dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculties at the New School for Social Research.

The dissertation was a case study in depth of the dynamics of interaction between an evening college (School of General Studies) and its parent institution (Brooklyn College). These dynamics were analyzed from two points of view: (1) the structural-functional relationships of component unit and parent in the context of the sociology of formal or complex organizations (2) the implications of these relationships as they apply to practical questions of policy concerning the allocation of authority from parent to sub-organization.

While the case study was centered on the organizational interaction between parent and sub-unit at Brooklyn College, from a broader point of view light is shed on the relative merits and disadvantages of this type of organizational structure for all evening colleges.

The analysis was not limited to formal organizational structure and function. At relevant points, the dynamics of informal groupings and relationships were introduced.

The research involved examination of a vast number of official documents, correspondence, policy statements and other original data. It also involved many interviews, questionnaire surveys and statistical analyses.

For generously making a mass of this documentary material

available to me, I wish to express my deepest gratitude to Dr. Edwin H. Spengler, Dean of the School of General Studies. In addition, he spent countless hours with me in discussing theoretical and practical questions and in critically evaluating inferences and interpretations. Without his gracious and unstinting cooperation, completion of the dissertation would have been immeasurably more difficult.

To Dr. Deborah Offenbacher, the Chairman of my Dissertation Committee, I am indebted far more than I can adequately express. Her sensitivity as a human being, her dedication as a thesis advisor and her critical judgments as a scholar contributed very substantially in converting a heavy burden into a scholarly adventure. But for everything I have done and written, she shares no responsibility. This responsibility I alone bear.

I am also deeply appreciative of the opportunity to do my research under the "Culture of Schools Program" project directed by Dr. Stanley Diamond and supported by a grant from the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

A STUDY IN ORGANIZATIONAL INTERACTION BETWEEN AN EVENING COLLEGE AND ITS PARENT INSTITUTION

"Though change is inevitable,
change for the better is a
full-time job."
Adlai Stevenson

Approximately one-third of total college enrollments in the United States consists of part-time students in evening colleges. This form of mass education is a unique American phenomenon. No other country in the world has developed a comparable system of higher education. To a large segment of the urban population, part-time study in the evening toward a college degree represents the only educational means by which to achieve upward mobility. For many it is the only method of preparing against the threat of human obsolescence brought about by the technological advances of automation and cybernetics.

The Scope of the Study

The main analytical concerns of this study in organizational interaction are the structural ties and interactive relationships of an educational sub-organization and its parent collegiate institution. Specifically it is an intensive case study of Brooklyn College as the parent and the School of General Studies as the component unit which administers degree programs in the evening.[1] While concentrated on a particular organization, the case study is intended to promote a better understanding of the organizational processes that engage

---

1. Hereinafter referred to as SGS.

similar evening colleges operating under comparable conditions of management and control. For most evening colleges in the United States are structured in a parent-sub-unit form similar to that of Brooklyn College.

Existence of a sub-unit as an identifiable entity with an administrative apparatus of its own, though intimately tied to the power structure of the larger institution, implies a special purpose to be served both by the parent and component organizations. For more than a half century, the community need for evening colleges serving a different clientele from the day college has been recognized. It was in response to that need that the Evening Session and later SGS came into being at Brooklyn College. Once the sub-organization is given life, it strives for growth and development in its own terms within its own value system. But the formal arrangements are such that it constantly has to face the controlling restraints of the parent that gave it vitality.

What the sub-organization is, what it hopes to become and what, in fact, it does become are strongly conditioned, if not determined, by the organizational milieu in which it exists and operates. The sub-organization, by virtue of its quest for separate identity, seeks the freedom to formulate its own goals and implementing measures under conditions of coordinated control. Polar forces of freedom and restraint are thus in an incessant state of tension; and it is out of this dialectic that the interactive process must reach a synthesis of viable balance.

The Problem of Goals

In broad scope, the goal aspirations of the component must

harmonize with those of the parent institution and must gain its approval. The processes by which goals are harmonized and legitimated are the essence of the interaction between colliding forces, those of superimposed managerial control versus those of stirrings for managerial freedom. In the final analysis, the extent to which the sub-unit is accorded the freedom to define particular goals and to organize particular means of attaining them is dependent on the following factors:

1. The historical setting
2. The scarcity of shared resources
3. The essential nature of the goals

These factors are, to a large extent, influenced by pressures from the "external" environment, from sources "outside" the nuclear relationship of parent and sub-unit. In the case of Brooklyn College, for example, pressures from the City University, The Board of Higher Education, The City and State of New York, have played significant roles in generating the conditions requiring new adjustments and accommodations. Thus, while the microcosm of this study has been the School of General Studies and the institution in loco parentis, the forces of the "external" environment have been introduced at relevant points.

The Historical Setting

The historical trend since 1950 in the New York City municipal college system as a whole has been almost steady expansion and growth. The expansion was not only in the area of the conventional liberal arts baccalaureate degree but extended to wide diversification and experimentation with new programs.

During the first decade, until 1960, the sub-unit, too,

enjoyed relative freedom in embarking on new goals and new designs for their achievement. While in part SGS growth was mitigated by internal reorganization of its jurisdiction by top administration, it was subjected to relatively minor restraints by the parent body in seeking new goals. Adoption of new programs and their implementation, to be sure, required faculty, presidential and Board approval, but the expansionist climate was conducive to a high degree of freedom for SGS growth.

After 1960, the population bulge stimulated growth in the City University system with even greater intensity. In fact, the pressure for expansion was so strong that new two-year community colleges were created in order to take over a portion of the functions previously within the jurisdiction of the Schools of General Studies. Increased size and complexity made further "division of labor" and diversification of function necessary. Administrative leadership in the Schools of General Studies fought energetically for the retention of the programs they had instituted and nurtured but it was to no avail. Historical forces in the City, as in the State and the nation, were in the direction of separating the "junior" college curricula from the senior colleges; two-year degree programs were thus relegated to the community colleges. As a consequence, SGS experienced a major goal contraction.

This contraction SGS was powerless to resist. Nor did the parent organization lend its support to combat the contraction. In fact, the scarcity of space and resources, combined with the increased pressures on the day college to admit more students, were decisive

factors contributing to the parent's acquiescense in the jurisdictional contraction of one of its sub-units.

The Scarcity of Shared Resources

When space and facilities are to be apportioned among units of a complex organization, a ranking order of priority must be formulated in order to achieve maximum efficiency in resource utilization. In reality, the choices made in the allocation of scarce resources constitute choices in priority of goals. To allocate space for a new program or expansion of existing programs is to evaluate them as more worthy than competing claimants for the same space.

Decisions of this nature are so crucial at Brooklyn College that they are reserved for top management. The President retains the ultimate decision-making power in this critical area. However, he relies heavily on the recommendations of a faculty committee appointed by him.[2] Thus, once again, control is exercised by managerial authority "external" to SGS itself. Once the severe competition for shared space subsides through new building construction - a three or four year prospect - the hope of SGS is that its drives for greater self-determination and for realization of distinctive goals will not be frustrated in competition with values deemed superior by the parent.

The Nature of the Goals

Approval of SGS goals varies in the degree to which they are consistent with those of the parent organization The further the goal from the central purpose of the parent organization, the less the burden of establishing propriety and usefulness. But when the

---

2. The Committee consists of the Deans of the Faculties, Students, and Studies, Registrar and Supervisor of Buildings and Grounds. The SGS Dean is not a member of the Committee.

goal comes within the central purpose of the parent, i.e., liberal arts baccalaureate education, but diverges with respect to essence, implementation and clientele, a severe legitimation problem arises. Although, as Burton Clark points out, "pluralistic societies 'tolerate' minority values," the tolerance is contingent upon the legitimacy ascribed to the function.[3] In the case of vocational and professional two-year degree programs, for example, the faculty accepted the innovations in large part because of the support of the President and the active advocacy of the Board. On the other hand, goals which are clearly within the value system of the parent organization but which involve differences in approach, variations in content, requirements and methods necessitate stronger proof of validity, for they impinge more directly upon tradition. The purity of the central purposes of the parent organization and the sanctities surrounding these purposes are zealously guarded. New proposals for special innovative programs leading to the baccalaureate degree are, therefore, most rigorously scrutinized and often effectively resisted Resistance of day faculty to change and experimentation that questions customary and standardized goal definitions as well as the related procedures is a problem which SGS must always face.

The Problems of Innovation and Cooptation

In a discussion of the academic community, Clark Kerr succinctly states: "The external view is that the university is radical; the internal reality is that it is conservative."[4] Innovation comes hard at the university.

---

3. Clark, Burton, R. Organizational Adaptation and Precarious Values, in Etzioni, Amitai. Complex Organizations (Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965), p. 161
4. Kerr, Clark, The Uses of the University (Harper and Row, 1963), p. 94

For SGS, innovation was a vital part of its self-image, an end in itself. SGS viewed itself and, to a degree, was acknowledged as the innovative center of the undergraduate college. Structurally and administratively it is so constituted as to encompass programs and students which do not precisely "fit" the traditional baccalaureate patterns. Of the many proposals for innovation made by SGS, some of which were accepted and some of which were rejected, two critical examples were selected for intensive analysis. These examples not only demonstrate the institutionalized routes which any proposal must follow but they also illustrate the essential process of cooptation utilized to effect the adoption of innovative ventures.

The first example, the Special Baccalaureate Degree Program for Adults, had to pass rigorous faculty scrutiny; there was faculty concern that the innovative aspects might dilute the quality of the baccalaureate degree. Somewhat helpful and reassuring were the program's support and subsidy by a private, prestigious foundation. Significant also was the spirited support of the President and the Dean of the Faculties. But to gain full CIAS support,[5] faculty members were included in the major policy decisions from the outset. Not the least important, the original group of faculty members who prepared the initial blueprint of the program and who reported to the faculty at large were highly regarded and respected professors of the college.

The second example, the two-year Nursing Science Program,

---

5. The day college is named College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, herein abbreviated as CIAS.

was proposed by SGS in response to a strong, articulated community need to reduce the shortage of nurses. Two-year degree programs were already institutionalized in the college structure and the nursing science program could be readily meshed into that structure. Here, again, CLAS faculty were invited to join with SGS administration for making policy, for planning curriculum and for screening and selecting staff and students.

While the process of cooptation was effectively utilized for both programs, the methods differed. In the Special Baccalaureate Degree Program, the area of greatest stress was in the curricular adaptation and in student evaluation. In the Nursing Science project, on the other hand, the greatest need for cooptation was to select personnel for administration and faculty and to give them a berth in the college. For, in nursing, the qualifications of available personnel necessitated substantial modification of existing criteria normally utilized for full-time faculty of the college.

Cooptation is a technique by which to obtain the support of the "task environment" for the realization of organizational goals. Active participation by CLAS faculty in the decision-making process not only contributes to goal realization but also maintains prescribed jurisdictional spheres. Contravention and possible conflict is thus avoided.

Although the cooptative process is functional in goal achievement there are some dysfunctional consequences. First the process of cooptation takes time. Members of the "outside" group must be carefully selected with a view to their potential constructive contribution. Involvement of many individuals and committees in

the decision-making process slows down the developmental action. Cooptation may result in a laborious rate in having the innovation adopted and implemented. Second, and more important, the original idea or proposal usually undergoes substantial alteration. For cooptation necessarily involves a meeting of minds and compromise solutions. How different the resultant product is from the original conception or design depends on the nature of the project as well as on the dynamics of interaction.

The Special Baccalaureate Degree Program was indeed altered considerably from the original idea. It was not possible to take the broad giant steps hoped for in the initial visionary plan. Whether the program is "better" for the moderation cooptatively introduced is a matter of value judgment. The Nursing Science Program, too, experienced many changes of format and implementing measures as a result of the cooptative process. Most of these were highly constructive. The coopted CIAS faculty members became staunch supporters of this two-year professional program and strongly advanced its acceptance in a four-year liberal arts college. Yet, the Nursing Science curriculum and staff were never fully integrated into the college structure. Hence it was, rather, without significant opposition transferred to the community colleges in response to forces external to Brooklyn College.

The Problems of Authority and Responsibility

Limitations on authority involve intervening control by agencies not totally dedicated to the aspirations and strivings of the sub-unit. They create conditions of dependency in manifold directions. This is essentially the core problem of authority and responsibility confronting SGS.

Central to the functioning of a collegiate organization are its administration and faculty. In both areas, SGS has authority which is limited in scope. As to administration, the authority delegated by the President is primarily a concurrent one with the CLAS deans, - on student admissions, curricular planning, student counseling, extracurricular activities, allocation of budgetary "lines" and staffing. As to faculty, SGS simply has no faculty separate and apart from CLAS. A minor segment of the SGS instructional staff occupies SGS "lines" but it does not constitute SGS "faculty." On the contrary, "line" personnel are, for all intents and purposes, members of the "regular" college faculty though budgetary "lines" stem from SGS.

The by-laws of the Board of Higher Education vest broad powers in the faculty. Most important is the authority to determine the composition of its own membership. Selection, retention, tenure and promotion are its prerogatives. Having no separate faculty, SGS is dependent on the regular college faculty for the performance of these crucial functions.

The administrative link between SGS and the college faculty, organized along departmental lines, is represented by the deputy chairman. Choice of the deputy chairman is made by the department chairman with the concurrence of the SGS Dean. At most, the power of the Dean is to withhold acceptance of a person nominated by the department chairman. Amicable relations between the SGS Dean and department chairmen are the informal means which overcome the deficiencies of divided authority in appointing deputy chairmen. As a general practice, department chairmen usually confer with the

Dean as to the acceptability of a nominee or of several alternative nominees and they generally reach agreement. Rarely do disagreements ripen into stubborn conflict.

Similar shared authority pertains to the allocation of annual lines to individual departments. Both the SGS Dean and the Dean of the Faculties must jointly agree on the specific line allocation. Allocation of a line must also be acceptable to the department which holds the authority and bears the responsibility for recruitment and selection. Informal personal contacts between the SGS Dean and departmental committees are also significant in avoiding intransigent disagreements. Consensuality is the dominant motif of the operating relationships.

Certain dysfunctional consequences nevertheless flow from the divided authority. When identical professorial ranks are available for staffing both in SGS and CLAS, the priority of choice is usually retained by CLAS although, in theory, the department should give equality of treatment to SGS and CLAS. In practice, CLAS usually makes the first choice for itself. Lacking authority, SGS is powerless to prevent this "natural" but discriminatory practice.

Transfers of SGS line personnel to CLAS also exemplify a tendency with which SGS cannot effectively cope. While the SGS Dean theoretically has the authority, with the support of the Dean of the Faculties, to block a transfer from SGS to CLAS, as a matter of brute fact he is unable, in terms of the practicalities, to exercise this authority. Requests of department chairmen, inspired by the one who desires the transfer, cannot easily be rejected. In

addition, petitions and importunities by the applicant, who in almost all cases presents conditions of undue hardship, similarly cannot be lightly dismissed.

Efforts of the SGS Dean to stem the tide have taken the indirect form of erecting obstacles to easy transfer. Recruitment by the department of a person for SGS with qualifications comparable to those of the transferee has been made a condition of transfer. But this has been relatively feeble in ebbing the flow. Another developing technique is that of withdrawing the SGS line from the department. Whether this technique will prove more effective only the future can tell. In the meantime, transfer opportunities take their toll in undermining the stability of SGS staff.

Normally, control of the purse strings brings a high level of power. While the total budget allocated to SGS may be considered shoe-string financing, nevertheless the Dean's power to fix rates of compensation of part-time staff and to apportion funds to departments enables him to influence certain staffing decisions. Control of the budget affords him substantial power in scheduling sections and courses. These indirect means create the opportunity to mold the composition of staff to a high degree. This opportunity is most evident in the category of off-campus lecturers. While the department has the authority to appoint and to retain or dismiss, the Dean's power to allocate funds and to establish rates of compensation creates the boundaries for selection of staff.

The Dean's control of staff varies with the category of personnel involved. His authority is on a continuum, least with respect to line personnel (13% of staff), more with respect to CIAS faculty teaching on

an overtime basis (27% of staff), most with respect to off-campus lecturers (60% of staff). The closer the category parallels the day college's formal prescriptions, the less the Dean's power.

On the surface, it would appear that the maximum control pertaining to 60% of the staff is a blessing in terms of authority, for it is this segment of the staff that provides highest flexibility in staff composition. But this blessing is not unmixed since the flexibility is acquired at an exceedingly high price. The off-campus lecturer category is the least stable, experiences the highest turnover, is the lowest paid and enjoys none of the fringe benefits of tenure, retirement and other important working conditions.

These factors make it difficult to insist on the same graduate degree qualifications that reflect the conventional pattern of CLAS faculty. In a college milieu where social status and ranking is so directily related to such academic qualifications, the differences in credentials of many of the off-campus lecturers inexorably result in marginal status both to the group and to SGS as a whole.

The circle then becomes somewhat vicious in contour. Since lecturers are essentially part-time and temporary, it is difficult to expect them to assume comprehensive responsibilities in the operations of SGS other than the teaching of classes and counseling of students. Nor can they reasonably be expected to participate actively in policy-making decisions either at the departmental or SGS levels. Even if such responsibility were imposed as a condition of employment, the absence in the by-laws of legal authority so to act is an insurmountable obstacle. Policy-making decisions in many critical areas are reserved for the faculty and SGS has no independent faculty.

The Problems of Stress and Strain

Stress and strain are revealed in the problems of establishing goals, of introducing innovations and of dealing with ambiguities and cross-currents in the patterns of authority and responsibility. These are mainly internal stresses and strains. But there are also forces external to both parent organization and sub-unit which exert pressures on either or on both and which result in internal stress. Three significant examples of external pressures, each of which evoked conditions of stress and strain on SGS, have been analyzed. Identified by source these pressures came from:

1. The City University
2. The College as Transmitter
3. The Board of Higher Education

Pressure from the City University

Hampered by limited funds for new building construction and pressed by increasing demands for higher levels of student admissions of an ever growing college-age population, the City University faced a serious dilemma. Procurement of construction funds and actual construction are necessary but they are arduous and long-term solutions. In the meantime, the colleges resisted increased admissions because they were already operating in excess of normal capacity. How solve the dilemma?

The Dean of Studies of the City University, aware that priority choices would have to be made to enlarge "operation shoe horn", suggested that priority be given to the "prime concern" of the colleges, namely fully-matriculated day college students. He, therefore, proposed an admissions program in which first priority would be accorded to the

"prime concern" and lowest priority to SGS non-matriculated students. In order to enlarge capacity for the admission of full-time matriculated students, he proposed that the dividing line between night and day be erased. Extinction of the evening colleges as separate entities would be the necessary consequence. This was a threat of major proportions.

The day colleges were strong enough to resist some of the pressure for increased enrollments. Day faculty vigorously opposed those aspects of the proposal which would have extended their working "day" far into the night. In addition, the fees paid by non-matriculated students were not expendable since the necessary budgetary appropriations anticipated were not granted.

The proposals were thus not adopted but they left their mark on SGS. For the City University had expressly stated its priority choices. In the wake of this drastic evaluation by "top management", SGS administrators, faculty and students suffered the pangs of insecurity and anxiety.

Transmitted Pressure from the College

Another struggle was precipitated within Brooklyn College because of the failure of the Board to procure and the City to provide ample funds for sorely needed new construction. This failure of action by other authorities constituted an external source of pressure. Without new space and facilities, competition within the college for these resources became more severe. As a result, expansion of a segment of the SGS student population as well as new program development by SGS was threatened with curtailment.

In only the non-economy of heaven, where there is no scarcity of resources, is competition absent.[6] Competition among units of a

---

[6] Hamilton, Walton, "Competition", Encyclopedia of Social Sciences, Vol. IV, p. 141-147 (Macmillan, 1930).

college or university for scarce resources is reasonably to be expected. However, when competition becomes so keen that the larger organization blocks program development of the component unit, it is no longer competition but contravention. While competition may be stimulating, contravention can only be repressing.

An effort was also made to block SGS expansion of the non-matriculated student category. Only the intervention of the President frustrated this contravention attempt. Yet even this apparent affirmation by the President of SGS interests contained seeds of stress and strain. For it was believed - and rumor abounded - that the President's action was motivated less by a commitment to SGS objectives than by the college's need for the fees paid by non-matriculated students.

Pressure from the Board

Pressures exerted from the "outside" on the day college as the primary target also reverberate into SGS. Multiple position regulations of the Board limiting the number of overtime work-hours of day faculty had a severe impact on the available supply of personnel for SGS. The Board's action was made feasible by higher salary levels and reduced teaching schedules developed over a course of years. In light of these developments, accrediting agencies were quite critical of the high level of "overtime" teaching permitted at the City University.

To comply with national norms as well as to respond to the criticism of accrediting agencies, the Board adopted a resolution providing for a gradual reduction, over a five year period, of permissible overtime hours While the Board's action was basically directed at the day college operation, it profoundly affected the availability of CIAS faculty for SGS administration and teaching

Cooperation came into play to ease the stress and strain.

Since additional SGS annual lines to replace CIAS faculty, a necessary condition for the reduction of permissible overtime hours) did not eventuate at the rate anticipated, the Deans of the Schools of General Studies petitioned the Board to extend the timetable of reduction. Accordingly, the Board retarded the planned rate of reduction in permissible overtime work. At Brooklyn College, too, both the President and the Dean of Administration acted cooperatively by liberally interpreting the regulation for SGS administrative officers and by granting exceptions for teaching personnel when special circumstances indicated undue hardship.

Consequences of Stress and Strain

Pressures from the outside which evoke stress and strain place parent and sub-unit on a different level of being and becoming. The impact on each varies in terms of the nature of the pressure, its primary target and the consequences at stake. Moreover, each entity has different resources and abilities with which to cope with pressures. Indeed, in some cases the power elite may decide to allow certain pressures to bear more heavily on the sub-unit as a way of alleviating the pressures upon itself In other cases, the parent may join forces with the sub-unit in tactics of resistance or delay. The parent organization, which holds the superordinate position, has the choice as to the course to follow. Such choice is not readily available to the subordinate unit.

As is true in any society, outside pressures affect different segments of the society differently and thus modify internal arrangements and relationships. Each segment endeavors to influence the direction and magnitude of change so as to maintain or improve its

position - of power, of resource control of existence itself.

External pressures are part and parcel of the dynamism of a changing scene and they generate the need for readjustments in relationships. An academic organization has to face these realities as do other institutions in the society.

The Problems of Image and Identity

One method of coping with the varieties of internal and external pressures experienced by an organization is to project a favorable image to its publics. To SGS, a very significant public is the community of evening colleges throughout the nation. It is with this community that it identifies both in terms of basic objectives and implemental resources by which to achieve them. Another interest in common with other evening colleges is that of combatting the negative stereotype of relatively lower atandards and status compared to the day colleges.

The publics to which SGS addresses itself more directly and intimately are included in its "task environment." To a large extent, the allocation of budget, space, designation of authority and responsibility as well as support and approval of goals rest on the confidence which SGS as a suborganization is able to evoke, or, to put it another way, on the image it projects.

To a sub-unit in a larger organization, the image it seeks to establish is that of individuality, of identity so as to differentiate its characteristics and goals from the total organization and from other component units within that totality. Indeed, this differentiation is more than a striving for identity; it is frequently a struggle for survival. Its very being as a separate sub-organization depends to a substantial degree on its distinctiveness in goals coupled

with power and authority incorporating a reasonable degree of freedom in implementing its unique objectives.

In order to affirm its identity and implicitly to assure its survival, SGS utilizes a number of image-projecting and identifying techniques. A public relations program, separate staff handbook, social functions, faculty conferences, separate faculty club, evening honor society, etc. are all developed and supported to enhance the SGS image and to reenforce its separateness from the day college. But this striving for distinct identity carries a high price tag. As a sub-unit with powerful organizational ties to the day college, SGS is constrained to conform in a large measure to the normative structure of the day college. Its students, staff, admission and grading standards are evaluated by day session norms in day session terms. The claim by SGS administration that it achieves quality higher education for its adult population by "equivalent" though not "identical" standards is seriously questioned by day faculty and administration. While SGS enjoys high status in the evening college community and is ranked in the upper echelon by evening college national standards, on its own campus it must constantly defend the quality and performance of its part-time students, particularly those in the non-matriculated category.

What does SGS faculty and staff think of the students they teach vis-a-vis full-time day students? A questionnaire survey revealed that while the SGS student is considerably more "tired" than his day session counterpart, he is more "mature," more "responsibly adult" and has a greater "respect for learning." The SGS student is also more "highly motivated" yet, at the same time, less "prepared for college" than the day student. The heterogeneous character of

the student body was viewed in both positive and negative terms. Affirmatively, the diversity in student body is "challenging" and makes teaching "more interesting"; negatively, the diversity presents a hardship and "unfair burden" on both teacher and student. The affirmative statements regarding the heterogeneity of the student body (46%) outweighed the negative statements (33%).

Responses to questions on working conditions in SGS revealed that what the teaching staff "liked best" about working in SGS was the type of student and the enjoyment and challenge of teaching. What he "liked least" centered more on low salaries, lack of job tenure and the second class status accorded the evening college.

The questionnaire also posed a hypothetical choice between teaching in SGS and in a day college. To this question, 65% of all respondents would choose a day college, while only 13% would choose teaching in SGS.* Type of student led the reasons for the choice of a day college (53%) but status (52%) was given practically equal weight in the decision. Following closely was time of work (49%). Thus, while SGS staff rank SGS students comparatively higher than day students, when asked to react to student characteristics they, nevertheless, cite type of student as the leading reason for choice of a day college. The seeming paradox can probably be explained by the context of the question. When the question is not exclusively devoted to an evaluation of students but rather to the all-encompassing decision as to the individual's choice of a place where he would prefer to work, he apparently rationalizes his choice by citing type of student of the day college as a recognition of the superior status of the day college and, at the same time, as a legitimizing factor for his choice.

* 22% made no choice indicating that the choice depended on circumstances.

Finally, it becomes clear that there is no one image of SGS. Just as there is no one account of an historical event but rather a "variety of histories," so there is a variety of images. The image is conditioned by the ideal and material interests of the individuals and groups who react to the situation. Each has its own "definition" or "frame of reference." Thus SGS is, to its own administration, a "first-line college;" its character is diverse, richly variegated and innovative. At the same time, it struggles with underprivileged status and resources. To CLAS faculty, SGS diversity is a liability for it does not conform to the normative pattern and the quality standards set for full-time day students and faculty. To an official accrediting agency,[7] SGS is doing a creditable job within the stringent limitations imposed by lack of adequate financing and resources.

Thus SGS is confronted by a polar challenge. While it continues to stress the consistency of an image combining "quality" with "second-chance opportunity" and "diversity" with "role integrity," these projections are directed to a community which equates "quality" on the basis of traditional evaluative criteria. It is clear that the very factors which give SGS its raison d'etre, - its second-chance philosophy and its multi-dimensional goals, coupled with a long history of underprivilege with respect to fiscal and human resources, constitute the major stumbling blocks in its struggle for a positive image and organizational identity at its own home base.

A Typology of Evening Colleges

Despite variations among evening colleges in structural relationships, authority and responsibility, teaching staff composition,

---

7. Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools

curriculum control, student admission policies and budgetary financing, evening colleges throughout the country can nevertheless be classified into three ideal types.[8] These are:

1. Integrated fully with the parent institution
2. Autonomous as a separate college
3. Sub-unit under coordinated control

The Fully Integrated Type

The essential characteristic of this type, which comprises a small minority, is that of no organizational separation of day and evening operations. Authority and responsibility rest in the overall administration of the institution though an evening dean or director may be designated ministerially to carry out policies and programs promulgated by the central authorities of the institution. Regular faculty teach either in the day or evening though temporary lecturers usually supplement the regular faculty in the evening. Assignments to teach in the evenings rotate among permanent faculty as part of the regular teaching load; overload compensation for evening teaching is not customary. Students are free to choose day or evening attendance either entirely or for part of their programs. Admission and academic standards are the same for both day or evening. Curriculum and degrees are the same for both.

Implicit in the fully integrated type is the assumption that dissimilarities between day and evening in student age ranges, life experiences, primary or secondary commitments to education, full-time or part-time attendance and other differential factors are irrelevant.

---

8. These three ideal types and their relative distribution were confirmed by a mail survey of forty representative institutions, members of the Association of University Evening Colleges. Total membership of the Association is about 150 evening colleges. A copy of the questionnaire is included in the Appendix.

Hence all standards - admission, retention, curriculum, level of instruction, requirements for the degree and other academic criteria - are uniform for all. To assure such uniformity, controls are centralized in one administration and faculty for the total institution.

Autonomous as a Separate College

The most salient characteristic of this type of organization, also in a small minority, is parity of position of the evening college with the other colleges of the university. Sometimes the evening college has a distinctive name like Millard Fillmore College of Buffalo University; more frequently it is called University College like that at Rutgers University and elsewhere.

In this autonomous type, day and evening colleges have slight overlapping of administration and faculty though a symbiotic relationship exists between the colleges. Each has its own independent administration and faculty. The evening Dean reports directly to the President or to his deputy, such as a vice-president. Admission policies, academic standards, curricula, degree requirements and all aspects of student life are autonomously determined. The degrees may be the same as those of the day college though not in all cases. At Columbia University, for example, the B.A. degree is specifically identified as having been conferred by the School of General Studies as distinguished from that of Columbia College. The budget for the evening college is allocated by the fiscal authorities in the same manner as for any other college of the university.

The autonomous type is pluralistic in organizational philosophy. The view is that the dissimilarities of a heterogeneous student population

require distinctive goals and implementing measures. Because day deans and faculty may either not fully comprehend or may not actively support the distinctive goals, approaches, or implementing measures of the evening college, a separate administration and faculty are essential. By placing authority and responsibility in an autonomous unit singlemindedly dedicated to the interests of its unique student body, the evening operation can be relatively immunized from the traditions and orientations appropriate for the day but not the evening colleges.

Parent - Sub-unit Relationship

This organizational type, which has been intensively analyzed here as a case study, is distinctly the modal class of evening colleges. To summarize the essential characteristics, administrative authority stems from the President to whom the evening Dean is directly responsible. However, the Dean's authority is subject to a variety of controls by day deans and instructional departments. The evening college has no "faculty" of its own; teaching staff consists of a small number of regular lines and, in part, of permanent faculty recruited from the day on an overload basis. Temporary, part-time lecturers represent a large majority of the teaching staff. Primary control for the appointment, retention and promotion of teaching staff resides in the college instructional departments though the evening Dean shares in the process through concurrence or disapproval opportunities. Curriculum and degrees of the evening college are under the control of the parent institution.

Between the antipodes of full integration on the one side and full autonomy on the other side lies the broad modal class of parent - sub-unit. This type is not peculiar to the academic sphere;

many complex military, governmental, industrial, commercial and religious organizations are similarly structured. The object is to decentralize management while maintaining coordinated control. Management is decentralized in order to rationalize functions within manageable scales; control is coordinated from the top in order to harmonize the operations of each unit in accordance with the central purposes of the larger organization. Essentially the purpose is to keep each sub-unit in orbit.

Coordinated control, however, necessarily contemplates restraints on the sub-unit in goal-setting, in experimenting, in diversifying and in growing in conformity with its own visions. Greater self-determination is an organizational aspiration. But this wish for greater freedom meets the restraints of coordinated control and then tensions emerge. Parenthetically, a substantial body of opinion among evening deans and directors, as represented by views expressed at annual conventions of the Association of University Evening Colleges and in various publications, is strongly in favor of higher levels of autonomy in the evening college.[9] Though most evening deans and directors claim that they have strong allies in university and college presidents, they are critical of the shared authority with day deans and department chairmen.[10]

Adjustment of tensions is a basic law of organizational interaction. Mutual concessions and compromises have to be worked out in order to reach a state of equilibrium no matter how temporary

---

9. McMahon, Ernest E., Emerging Evening College (Columbia University, 1960) Ch. VII; Brigham Young University, A Self-Study of the Department of Evening Classes, (April 1966), pp. 19-65.

10. Association of University Evening Colleges, Salary Survey of Administrative Personnel (June 1965), footnote 1, p.3.

it may be. Not the least important means by which a sub-organization endeavors to attain its objectives is that of amicable inter-personal relationships with the power elite of the parent organization. These informal relations within the framework of the formal structure tend to moderate abrasive qualities inherent in shared authority under conditions of coordinated control.

Shared authority, however, is not a one way street. The sub-unit also shares more or less in the parent's power, prestige, traditions, know-how, and, most important, its human and material resources. SGS, for example, gains many benefits from the superior bargaining power of the College as a whole vis-a-vis the Board, the City and the State in relation to legislative, budgetary and a vast array of policy matters. SGS also gains stature for itself and for its students on the basis of the prestigious Brooklyn College degree with which it is identified. Talents, experience and skills in many areas - administration, faculty, library, counseling, audio visual, etc. - are garnered by the evening college from the parent college as are a considerable amount of physical and material resources. In short, the totality of human and material resources in the possession of the College are shared with the evening college on some reasonable basis.

In the case of the City University in general and Brooklyn College in particular, the Board in its by-laws and the President in his delegations of authority to the day and evening deans, respectively, have decreed the parent - sub-unit type of organization. Taking this type then as the one officially sanctioned, the basic question is how the structural and operating relationships can be

modified in order better to serve the interests of both decentralized management and coordinated control.

A Blueprint for Better Balance

Better balance could be achieved if administrative and faculty relationships were reorganized in the following manner:

1. Authority and responsibility of the SGS Dean should continue to stem directly from the President. But the administrative authority of the SGS Dean over all aspects of the evening programs, including policies on student admissions, curricular structures, academic standards, instructional staff, counseling and other auxillary services, should be independent of the day college deans.

2. The SGS instructional staff should consist primarily of full-time annual line personnel in professorial ranks attached to the day academic departments. This "core" staff may be supplemented to some extent, as conditions warrant, by CLAS permanent faculty (either on an overload or exchange basis) and by part-time, temporary lecturers. However, these lecturers should be classified in adjunct professorial ranks based on qualifications. Selection, appointment, promotion and tenure should continue to be functions of the day academic departments in consultation with the SGS Dean. The "core" staff should have the authority and responsibility of a "faculty" on all SGS policies and procedures of an academic nature. An internal committee structure of the core staff should be coupled with proportional representation on departmental and college-wide committees.

These two proposals are designed to achieve two basic purposes: first, in accordance with sound administrative practice, to vest in SGS administration the independent and full authority necessary to carry

out its responsibilities; second, to establish an SGS "core" instructional staff sufficiently large in numbers so that representation of the SGS interests is significant in the decision-making processes of the college faculty. Thus, while these proposals maintain the essential character of the parent - sub-unit type of organization, they would rationalize authority, controls and responsibility in terms of evening college goals, program development, individual and institutional status, and operating procedures.

Administrative Authority of SGS Dean

The scope of authority delegated to the SGS Dean is determined by the President. While he made the evening dean directly responsible to him, he limited the evening dean's authority to one of concurrence with that of the day deans. It is this power of concurrence by day deans that gives rise to duality of authority harboring a multiplicity of overlaps, intersections, criss-crosses and ambiguities. Duality of authority in the same broad areas of concern, particularly when means and ends are not always congruent, necessarily invites stresses and strains. Informal friendly relations, cooptation, bargaining to settle differences, and other informal measures to reach a modus vivendi frequently moderate stresses and strains. But when policy positions between deans become intractable and fixed, an impasse develops and then only the President can make the final decision. The situation in that case is an adversarial one, each dean competing for the crucial support of the President. In the role of arbiter between contestants, the President may find a solution satisfactory to both sides and save the respective faces of the vying deans. However, he may arrive at a solution satisfactory

to neither dean, in which event both feel the disappointment of inadequate support by the President. Such feelings have the tendency of impairing friendly relations among the deans. These feelings are intensified when the President fully supports the position of one dean and rejects the position of the other. Then there is a victor and a vanquished. It is this eventuality that sound administrative practice seeks to avoid. Authority must be as broad as the responsibility.

A recent resolution of the Board of Higher Education to establish the Bronx Center of Hunter College as an autonomous college in the Bronx is grounded in the same principle of sound administrative practice. Since 1931 Hunter College had operated on two widely separated campuses, the parent at midtown Manhattan and the branch in the upper Bronx. Enrollment at the Bronx branch had in the meantime grown roughly to the level of the original Manhattan campus with a substantially similar scope of curricular offerings. Reports of several study committees "identified the weaknesses inherent in the present split-campus arrangement and the educational desirability of college status for the Bronx campus. Separation would meet student and community needs for a four-year municipal college in the Bronx with sufficient flexibility to meet expanding enrollment needs."[11] In adopting the proposal for separation, the Executive Committee of the Board of Higher Education noted that "The full complement of a college administration would permit better planning for facilities, library, office space and a graduate program presently recognized as deficient because of the administrative control exercised at the geographically separated parent campus."[12]

---

11. Board of Higher Education, amendment to the Third Interim Revision (1967) of the 1964 Master Plan for the City University of New York, p. 1.

12. Ibid., Meeting of August 2, 1967

The Executive Committee also expressed the view that "Better quality faculty could be recruited because of greater promotional opportunities that would result from college status... Faculty at the Bronx Campus was generally concentrated at the lower ranks with the result that the most competent faculty sought transfer to the parent campus where a fuller range of opportunities was found."[13] This reference is reminiscent of the SGS problem concerning its instructional staff.

The administrative and faculty weaknesses of a split-campus arrangement are quite analogous to the split-authority arrangement in the parent - sub-unit relationship in the same organization. Briefly and simply to paraphrase the language of the Executive Committee of the Board of Higher Education in the Hunter College situation: The full complement of administrative authority in the evening dean, independent of the day deans, would permit better planning to meet student and community needs by the evening college.

Redefinition of the evening dean's authority to make it co-extensive with his responsibility requires the acceptance by the President of the wisdom of this basic administrative principle. Furthermore, his support of the experimental and innovative drives of the evening college as well as its search for self-identity and integrity must receive his positive affirmation. This means, in essence, the approval by the President of the organizational philosophy that monolithic standards and procedures are not apodictic for both day and evening but that varying standards and procedures, though not identical, nevertheless may be equivalent in quality. To attain these, the evening dean's authority must be as broad as his responsibility and this

---

13. Ibid., p. 2.

is within the executive powers of the President to grant.

SGS Instructional Staff

Of grave concern is the small number of annual lines in SGS in relation to student enrollment. If the faculty-student ratio in SGS on a full-time equivalent were the same as the 1:15 ratio of CLAS, a full-time staff of about 330 teachers for the approximate 10,000 students would produce parity. However, the actual number of full-time annual lines is about 58. Thus if all SGS students, whether matriculated or non-matriculated were counted, a deficit of 272 full-time annual lines would result.

However, SGS annual lines, though projected on the student-faculty ratio of 1:15, are limited by budgetary authorities to the full-time equivalent of matriculated students only. Thus non-matriculated students are excluded from the 1:15 ratio. In part, this exclusion rests on the consideration that the State does not provide financial aid to the City for non-matriculated students; the State aid formula is cast in terms of matriculated students only.[14] It is substantially for that reason that non-matriculated students are charged tuition fees. But at present these tuition fees are pledged to the Construction Authority to guarantee the payment of principal and interest on bond issues for new construction. It would, therefore, appear fair and equitable that the SGS Tax Budget should reflect this pledge of fee funds made for a purpose beneficial to the institution as a whole.

It is, however, hardly likely that sufficient budget would be provided by the City to create SGS annual lines in accordance with the 1:15 faculty-student ratio also embracing non-matriculated students.

---

14. New York State Education Law, Sec. 6215.

Moreover, there would be a loss of the cross-fertilization advantages of having a cadre of CIAS faculty teaching in SGS as well as a reduction of desirable staffing flexibility represented by part-time temporary lecturers. Nevertheless, the goal should be a dominance of numbers in SGS annual lines supplemented by a minority of CIAS faculty and temporary lecturers. Such dominant number in its instructional staff would then constitute for SGS a core nucleus of full-time faculty members devoted to evening college goals, developments and standards. Moreover, this core nucleus could internally organize a committee structure in order to deal with SGS goals, developments, and standards.

Equally important is proportional or other reasonable representation by members of this SGS core nucleus on departmental and college wide committees in order to have a significant voice for SGS instructional staff in selection, appointment, promotion and tenure which remain the functions of the day academic departments. This proportional or other reasonable representation should also apply to the whole gamut of committee concerns, from curriculum to space, which are within the jurisdiction of departmental, presidential and faculty committees.

It must be repeated that this proposal does not involve alteration of present faculty authority and responsibility for the college as a whole. Only one faculty would exist; in it a larger number of SGS line personnel would be incorporated. But this SGS sector would be concerned for SGS with the usual functions of a faculty; and through adequate representation on departmental, presidential and faculty committees would constitute a bridge in curricular and other matters of common interest.

Of considerable importance is the granting of adjunct professorial titles to part-time lecturers. Provisions for granting such titles were

adopted by the Board of Higher Education in January 1965 but they were very meagerly implemented. These titles were intended for persons who are engaged full-time in professional, technical and business activities in the work-a-day world and who devote part-time to teaching in SGS. They bring to SGS their learning and practical experience in areas intimately related to their major fields of activity. Their contribution to the teaching staff is of great value. Full implementation of the declared policy of adjunct professorial titles — a practice quite common in evening colleges — based upon qualifications equivalent to the respective full-time lines, will enhance the prestige of both the person and SGS. The title of Lecturer should be limited to those teachers with qualifications below those of adjunct professorial lines.

The policy with respect to adjunct professorial lines should also involve adjustment of the rates of compensation per course so that they are proportionate, in relation to departmental teaching load, to the annual salary and incremental steps of the corresponding regular ranks. Thus, if the departmental teaching load is 12 contact hours, a teaching schedule as an adjunct professor of six contact hours would be equated to a course rate resulting in 50% of the regular line earnings.

While adjunct professorial lines would not imply permanent tenure, they would have the effect of generating much greater staff stability and allegiance than now exists. If adjunct professorial titles and ranks were joined with commensurate levels of compensation, SGS would be in a position to expect responsible participation in SGS committees, study and task groups, and other functions that are usually within the ambit of a faculty's concerns. Such expectation would then not rest on a pious hope of individual dedication but rather on the firm sociological bases of status and role prescriptions.

TO MOLD THE FUTURE

The modifications in organizational relationships suggested in the blueprint would not only correct existing deficiencies of the present parent-sub-unit structure; it would also, from the point of view of organizational theory, enable SGS better to achieve its educational objectives of providing opportunities for quality higher learning to a large segment of society unable to attend college during the day. Night is the SGS domain and it is at that time that SGS seeks to provide adults with the legacy endowed through centuries past by creative and reflective minds.

For School of General Studies Teaching Staff

I. General Information

A. Division: Liberal Arts ___ Vocational Studies ___

B. Instructional Department _____

C. Number of years in SGS ___

D. This semester in SGS, I teach

1. elective course(s) ___
2. introductory course(s) ___
3. both ___

II. Brooklyn College Affiliation

Please check all that applies to you.

A. Annual line:

Rank	College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (CLAS) annual line	School of General Studies (SGS) annual line
Professor		
Assoc. Prof.		
Asst. Prof.		
Instructor		
Lecturer (sub.)		

B. Lecturer In SGS (not on annual line): _____

What is your highest academic degree? _____

III. Outside Affiliation

If you are a Lecturer in SGS (category "B" above), please check and fill in what applies to you in your outside work.

A. I work

1. at another four-year college or university ___
2. at a community college ___
3. at an elementary or high school ___

Position held (i.e., teacher, principal, etc.)_____

B. I am engaged in business or a profession ____

1. Type of business or a profession _____
2. Position _____

C. I am a graduate student _____

D. Other? Please state _____

x

IV. Below is a series of terms which have been used by instructors to describe students. Please select those terms which you think best describe typical full-time college students enrolled in day classes. Please check:

1. highly motivated ____
2. vocationally oriented ____
3. respect for learning ____
4. tired ____
5. complacent ____
6. mature ____
7. rigid ____
8. fearful ____
9. responsibly adult ____
10. hardworking ____
11. over-anxious about grades ____
12. confused about goals ____
13. unprepared for college ____
14. well-prepared for classes ____
15. analytical ____
16. challenging to instructor ____

Add others if you wish _____

_____

_____

V. Below is a series of terms which have been used by instructors to describe students. Think of the characteristics of the School of General Studies student body as you perceive it from your own experience here. Please select those terms which you think best describe SGS students. Please check:

1. highly motivated ____
2. vocationally oriented ____
3. respect for learning ____
4. tired ____
5. complacent ____
6. mature ____
7. rigid ____
8. fearful ____
9. responsibly adult ____
10. hardworking ____
11. over-anxious about grades ____
12. confused about goals ____
13. unprepared for college ____
14. well-prepared for classes ____
15. analytical ____
16. challenging to instructor ____

Add others if you wish _____

VI. What I like best about working in SGS is _____

VII. What I like least about working in SGS is _____

VIII. In my opinion, the most important problem the School of General Studies of Brooklyn College faces today is _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

IX. If somebody came to you today stating that he has a choice between teaching in the School of General Studies and a day college, what would you advise him to do?

_____

What is the basis for your advice? Please check:

Type of student ____
Salary ____
Time of work ____
Curriculum ____
Status ____
Work load ____
Class size ____

Other? Please state _____

_____

Please return before May 26, 1966 to:
Mrs. Myrtle S. Jacobson
Office of the Director
School of General Studies

BROOKLYN COLLEGE
OF
THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
BROOKLYN, NEW YORK 11210

SCHOOL OF GENERAL STUDIES
OFFICE OF THE DEAN

June 22, 1967

Dear Dean

With respect to evening colleges offering degree programs, I am making a study of:

1. The structural relationship to the parent institution
2. The lines of administrative authority and responsibility
3. The source and composition of the teaching staff
4. The control of the curriculum

Thus far, the facts seem to indicate three general types:

1. Fully integrated — no separation of day and evening operations. Authority and responsibility are in overall administration. Instructional staff overlaps (no overload compensation) though temporary lecturers supplement evening staff. Curriculum and degrees are the same for day and evening.

2. Fully autonomous as a separate college. No significant overlapping of administration and faculty between day and evening. Authority stems from president or board of trustees. Curriculum control is separate though degrees may be the same.

3. Parent-sub-unit type where evening administration has specified but limited authority subject to a variety of controls by day deans and instructional departments. Teaching staff may be, in part, recruited from day staff on an overload basis. Temporary lecturers supplement the staff. Teaching staff appointed by day instructional departments. Curriculum is controlled by day and the degrees are the same for both.

I need your aid in completing my study. Will you please co-operate by sending me a brief description of (1) your institutional structure, (2) lines of authority, (3) faculty and curriculum controls? Whatever variations from the listed general categories you wish to indicate will be most helpful.

Needless to say, I shall greatly appreciate your co-operation and prompt reply.

Sincerely yours,

Myrtle S. Jacobson

MYRTLE S. JACOBSON

MSJ:ca